

REMARKS

Claims 4-8, 11-13, 15, 18-20, 22-25, 27-29, 32-34, 36-39, 41-43, 46-48, 50-53, 55-57, 60-62, 64-67, 69-71, 79-80, 83, 85-89, 92, 95, 98, 100-103, 105-123, and 125 were previously canceled without prejudice to their later prosecution in this or another application. Claims 78 and 126-131 have been cancelled herein without prejudice to their later prosecution in this or another application. Claims 1-3, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 21, 26, 30, 31, 35, 40, 44, 45, 49, 54, 58, 59, 63, 68, 72-77, 81, 84, 91, 94, 97, 104, and 124 have been amended. Since all of those inventions are reasonably conveyed by the specification and original claims, there is no issue of new matter.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-3, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 21, 26, 30, 31, 35, 40, 44, 45, 49, 54, 58, 59, 63, 68, 72-77, 81, 82, 84, 90, 91, 93, 94, 96, 97, 99, 104, and 124 are pending.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-3, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 21, 26, 30, 31, 35, 40, 44, 45, 49, 54, 58, 59, 63, 68, 72-78, 81, 82, 84, 90, 91, 93, 94, 96, 97, 99, 104, 124 and 126-131 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly, failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, the Office maintains that the claims, insofar as they embrace hydrates and solvates are not enabled. While Applicant continues to disagree with the Office, to expedite prosecution and without in any way conceding to the propriety of the rejection, Applicant has amended the claims herein to delete reference to hydrates and solvates. Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

In addition, claims 78 and 126-131 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. While Applicant continues to disagree with the Office, to expedite prosecution and without in any way conceding to the propriety of the rejection, Applicant has cancelled those claims herein. Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 78, 81 and 131 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. While Applicant continues to disagree with the Office, to expedite prosecution and without in any way conceding to the propriety of the rejection, Applicant has cancelled claims 78 and 131 herein and amended

claim 81 herein as suggested by the Office. Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 78 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claim 78 is also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. While Applicant continues to disagree with the Office, to expedite prosecution and without in any way conceding to the propriety of the rejection, Applicant has cancelled that claim herein. Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended the claim to correct an inadvertent typographical error, i.e., the omission of the word "to." Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: November 12, 2009

By: 
Lauren L. Stevens
Reg. No. 36,691

Tel: (650) 849-6614
Email: lauren.stevens@finnegan.com